

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 2-4, 7-8, 12, 14, 19, 26-29, and 33-37 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claim 1 has been amended to limit R, Y, ring A, Z^1 , Z^2 , Z^3 , and sulfur oxide in formula (I). Claim 13 has been amended to limit Z^{2a} in formula (Ia). Claim 20 has been amended to limit compounds included in this claim in addition to editorial revisions. Claims 11 and 22-25 have been amended editorially.

The verified English translation of the priority document Japanese Patent Application No. 2002-338939 is attached hereto. Accordingly, the priority date of the present application is November 22, 2002.

The abstract of the disclosure has been objected to because of being not complying with the 150-word limit. The abstract has been amended to be within the 150-word limit. Accordingly, this objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 22-25 and 34-37 have been objected under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form. Claims 22-25 have been amended to remove the "for use limitations". Claims 34-37 have been canceled. Accordingly, this objection should be withdrawn.

Claim 20 has been objected to because of the informalities. Claim 20 has been amended to correct the term to "chloro". Accordingly, this objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11, 19, 21-25, and 33-37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu et al. in view of Patani et al. (Chem. Rev.). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully note that the reference to International Patent Application Publication No. WO 2005/101595 is an error. Chu et al. are applicants of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0101595. According to U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0101595, the earliest possible prior art date of the Chu reference is February 21, 2003, on which the provisional application was filed. This date is later than the November 22, 2002 priority filing date of the present application as discussed above. Accordingly, the Chu reference is not prior art against the present application.

Accordingly, claims 1, 5-6, 9, 11, and 21-25 are distinguished from Chu in view of Patani, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 33-37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as not complying with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 2 and 33-37 have been canceled. Thus, this rejection is moot. Applicants do not concede the correctness of this rejection.

In view of the above, Applicants request reconsideration of the application in the form of a Notice of Allowance.




Dated: February 12, 2009

DPM/my/ad

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: 
Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300